

REMARKS IN RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION:

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner indicates that claims 6–11, 14, 16–18, 20, 22–28, and 30–35 are allowable.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's acknowledgement of allowable subject matter.

REMARKS REGARDING AMENDMENTS

Claim 1 has been amended so that the scope and language of the claim is clearer and more precise in defining what the Applicant considers to be the invention. Support for the above amendments can be found at least in the original specification, claims, and drawing as no new matter has been added. The Applicant appreciates the telephone conference with the Examiner during which the rejection of claim 1 based on the cited reference was discussed. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as amended, is clearly distinct and patentable over the prior art of record and therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner enter these requested amendments and that all claims be allowed.

FIRST REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,905,482 to Gheblikian (“Gheblikian”). Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Gheblikian discloses a ring that includes a slot to hold a setting. The setting is held inside of the slot by a slideable door. Gheblikian does not disclose, teach, or suggest the “capture” module as required by the independent claim 1. Claim 1 as amended requires a module that has at least two portions and that at least a portion of the setting is positioned between the at least

Serial No.: 10/649,309
Confirmation No.: 5404
Applicant: Ronald W. Hartgrove
Atty. Ref.: 11149.0030.NPUS00

two portions of the module to prevent the setting from escaping the mounting area. As discussed above, Gheblikian discloses a slideable door that covers the opening of a slot designed to hold a setting. Gheblikian fails to teach a module that has two portions such that at least a portion of the setting is positioned between the two portions of the module. Instead, the door is only positioned adjacent to the portion or portions of the setting closest to the opening. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 1 as anticipated by Gheblikian.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and thus, incorporates each limitation therein. Therefore, claim 5 is allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner also reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claim 5 as anticipated by Gheblikian.

Given the above, Applicant requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of claims 1, 5–11, 14, 16–18, 20, 22–28, and 30–35 in the next paper from the Office. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to discuss any issues or questions raised by this paper.

Respectfully submitted,



Rexford A. Johnson

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 57,664

Tel. 713-787-1697

Date: May 30, 2006